compulsory portion. *Held,* (1) that his contention was not well-founded with respect to the immovable property, inasmuch as the rights therein were controlled by the law of the *situs* and the French law did not confer upon the surviving husband or wife a right to a compulsory portion; and (2) that he was entitled to the enjoyment during his life of one-third of the wife's movable property in accordance with the provisions of the Italian law. *Tisserand v. Pellegrino* (1917, Tribunal civil de Nice) 44 CLUNET, 1792.

See COMMENTS, p. 181.

CONFLICT OF LAWS—WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—EXTRATERRITORIAL INJURY.—An employer doing a general contracting business in the Northwest, but with general offices in Minnesota, made in that state a contract with a workman to go to another state to work. While so employed the workman was killed by an accident arising out of and in the course of his employment. His dependents in Minnesota claimed compensation in that state under the state Compensation Act. *Held,* that the claimants were entitled to recover under the Minnesota law. *State ex rel. Maryland, etc., Co. v. District Court* (1918, Minn.) 168 N. W. 177.

The decision is placed by the court upon the ground that the Minnesota act was intended to compensate for injuries, whether intraterritorial or extraterritorial, incurred as incidental to a business "localized in the state." For a discussion of the problems involved in this and similar cases, see (1917) 27 YALE LAW JOURNAL, 113; (1918) 27 *ibid.* 707.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—CLASS LEGISLATION—STERILIZATION OF THE MENTALLY DEFECTIVE IN STATE INSTITUTIONS.—A Michigan statute authorized the management of any publicly maintained institution for the insane and feeble-minded to render incapable of procreation any individual confined there who had been adjudicated by the proper court to be a proper subject for such treatment. The superintendent of an institution applied for a writ of *mandamus* to compel such adjudication in respect of an inmate of his institution. *Held,* that the statute was unconstitutional as denying equal protection of the laws, and that no writ should issue. *Haynes v. Lapeer Circuit Judge* (1918, Mich.) 166 N. W. 938.

The prevention of procreation by criminals and imbeciles has been advocated for some time by scientists and societies. See 27 MEDICO-LEGAL JOUR. 134; Warner, *American Charities,* 133 f. Whatever may be said of the operation as a punishment for crime,—on which see Baldwin, *Whipping and Castration as Punishments for Crime* (1899) 8 YALE LAW JOURNAL, 371, 380 ff.; *State v. Feilen* (1912) 70 Wash. 65, 126 Pac. 75, 41 L. R. A. (N. S.) 418 and note; and COMMENTS (1914) 23 YALE LAW JOURNAL, 363—the use of some such operation to prevent the propagation of imbeciles is highly desirable. For imbecility is an inheritable trait. Lombroso, *Crime: Its Causes and Remedies,* sec. 74; *Proceedings of National Conference of Charities and Correction* (1903) 245-253. And the mentally defective have a peculiar bent toward uncontrolled procreation. *Proceedings of National Conference of Charities and Correction* (1902) 154. To meet this statutes have been passed making it a crime—in substance—to obtain carnal knowledge of an imbecile, epileptic, etc., of the opposite sex, within the period of fecundity. (Ind.) Burns' Ann. St. 1914, secs. 2250, 2251. Exception is made in favor of husband or wife; but the issuance of a marriage license to persons of the restricted class is prohibited. *Ibid.* sec. 8365; but see *Franklin v. Lee* (1902) 30 Ind. App. 31, 62 N. E. 78. There seems to be no question as to the constitutionality of such statutes, nor as to their beneficial